UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/781,785	02/20/2004	Gary I. Wurtzel	026606-001000US	6634

20350 7590 05/25/2010

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER	
EVANS, KIMBERLY L	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3629	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/25/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/781,785	WURTZEL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KIMBERLY EVANS	3629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 February 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-38* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in reply to the response filed February 11, 2010.
2. Claims 1-38 are currently pending.
3. The Examiner has carefully reviewed the Applicants response and has determined that the rejection stands.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

   A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

   a. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
   b. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
   c. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
   d. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 1-10, and 14-23 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al., US Patent No. 5,764,98 in view of Gagne', US Patent No. US 6,353,437 B.

7. With respect to Claim 1,

Davis discloses the following limitations,

- *a host system to manage a pool of reusable characteristics, wherein the host system is configured to: interface, via a plurality of computers, with a first group of users and a second group of users,*(see at least figure 2, column 1 lines 21-27: "…the computer animation production system includes a first global area network and a second global area network; the first global area network communicates digital control information to the at least one information processing device and the second network separately communicates digital image data to the at least one information processing device…")
- *the first group of users being authorized to modify at least a portion of the pool of reusable characteristics,*
- *and the second group of users being authorized to develop a character or feature for a digital animation project by using reusable characteristics from the pool of reusable characteristics without modifying the reusable characteristics;*

  (see at least Figure 16, column 22, lines 48-57: "…a complete list of the scene database files to be returned is tabulated. Processing continues at block 618 during which the RETURN SCENE DATABASE FILE routine (FIG. 16) (see Section IV(m)) is called to evaluate the permission level of the user and to return one scene database file at a time according to the permission level (i.e. read-write, read-only, limited read-write) of the user. Depending on the permission level status of the user, the returned scene database file will either be deleted, saved or saved in part…")
- *receive a change to a first character or feature of the digital animation project from a member of available artists via a computer located remote from the host system and in operative*

communication with the host system over a network, the member being one of the second group of users;(see at least column 8, lines 22-24: "…The cel coloring capability of the workstation enables a user to change the color of lines and fill in areas with arbitrary colors selected from a customized palette..")

Davis discloses all of the above limitations, Davis does not distinctly disclose the following limtations, but Gagne however as shown discloses,

- *audit the change to the first character or feature to determine whether at least one reusable characteristic from the pool of reusable characteristics defines a dependency between the change and a second character or feature of the animation project; and*
- *when the host system determines that at least one reusable characteristic from the pool of reusable characteristics defines a dependency between the change and a second character or feature of the animation project, notify the computer of the dependency and provide the computer with access to the second character or feature of the animation project.*(see at least column 3, lines 33-37: "…(see at least column 10, lines 41-48: "…the animator can create a membership rule for the joint nodes or the character such that the rule evaluates as true for any joint node which is rotated outside a range of between 0 and 90 degrees, for example, with an evaluation interval of every frame, or interactively after every modification by the animator, and a parameter, such as "Highlight in Red", can be applied to the group defined by this rule…")

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method for coordinating production of an animated feature of Davis with the animation system of Gagne' because it provides an efficient means for providing rules-based groups of animation objects for use in an animation system.

8. With respect to Claims 2 and 16,

Davis and Gagne' disclose all of the above limitations, Davis further discloses,

- *wherein the pool of reusable characteristics contains meta-data relating to the character or feature*. (see at least Abstract: '…The digital control information includes image database information. The second global area network (6, 8, 10, 12 and 14) is for communicating the digital image data to the at least one information processing device (44-76). The digital image data includes pixel characteristic information for image reproduction on the information processing device…")

9. With respect to Claims 3 and 17,

   Davis and Gagne' disclose all of the above limitations, Davis further discloses,

   - *wherein the meta-data includes at least one of a control button, a preset feature, a macro, and a computer program to control the at least one reusable characteristic*. (see at least Figure 3, column 7, lines 39-49:"…Also coupled to the host computer 78 is a disk drive 140 for retaining operating system software (preferably a Unix operating system), local application software and database information received from the database 20 of the Animation Logistics System 23. Mouse 204, keyboard 206, and graphics tablet 203 enable a user at the workstation to communicate with host computer 78 by manipulating information on the control information display 202. Updating exposure-sheets, requests for digital image data, etc., are made by keyboard 206, mouse 204 or graphics tablet 203…")

10. With respect to Claim 4,

    Davis and Gagne' disclose all of the above limitations, Davis further discloses,

    - *wherein the pool of reusable characteristics is developed at least in part by an administrator*. (see at least column 5, lines 63-67: "…permitting an animator to define a dynamic group wherein the membership of objects in the group is determined according to a rule evaluated at appropriate intervals and each member of the group inherits the parameters, if any, defined for that group.

11. With respect to Claims 5,

Davis and Gagne' disclose all of the above limitations, Davis further discloses,

- *a plurality of the computers comprise a multi-user computer configured to allow a plurality of artists to log on* (see at least column 11, lines 15-35: "…In a multi-user system (in the preferred embodiment, 17 users could work simultaneously at the 17 workstations (44-76)) where more than one user can obtain a copy of a scene (i.e. digital image data and related databases inform) and make changes to it (read-write), … the requestor will be denied access (scene is locked) to the scene and an indication of the reason for denial as well as the identification of the workstation/user of that scene will be returned. For a more detailed discussion, see Section V(e)…")
- *wherein the pool of reusable characteristics is developed at least in part by the second artist*(see at least column 11, lines 62-66: "…Upon completion of the assignment by each workstation, the updated portions of the scene database file and image data files will be returned and merged with one another to form newly updated scene database and image data files…")

12. With respect to Claims 6, 18, and 20,

Davis and Gagne' disclose all of the above limitations, Davis further discloses,

- *wherein the member of the available artists is reviewed by an administrator prior to allowing the member to log on to one of the computers.*
- *wherein the second artist is a member of a group of available artists and each member of the group of available artists is reviewed by an administrator prior to entry into the group* (see at least column 9, lines 15-20: "…The production scheduling capability of Animation Logistics System 23 includes all of the functions that interactively allow an administrator or supervisory person to establish or change the production priorities in the computer animation production system 2…."; Figures 8a and 8b, column 12, lines 24-29: "…The

ACCESS ARBITRATION routine (FIGS. 8a and 8b) (see Section IV(e)) determines the accessibility of a requested file by evaluating the permission status level of the requesting user and the requested file and returns either an "access granted" or "access not available" message…")

13. With respect to Claim 8, and 21,

Davis and Gagne' disclose all of the above limitations, Davis further discloses,

- *the pool of reusable characteristics is configured to accept input to update the at least one reusable characteristic while the at least one reusable characteristic is in use.* (see at least column 6, lines 10-13: "…when an animator is interacting wit a scene, the membership rule can be evaluated after each user interface event so that the results of any changes made by the animator are shown to the animator as they are made…")

14. With respect to Claims 9, 10, 22, and 23,

Davis and Gagne' discloses all of the above limitations, Davis further discloses,

- *the member may update the at least one character or feature in a pool of characters or in a pool of features.*(see at least column 10, lines 50-52: "… the Animation Logistics System 23 updates the Archival Database to insure that the archived files are properly tracked…")
- *an administrator may review the updated at least one character or feature prior to accepting the updated at least one character or feature.*

(see at least column 3, lines 30-34: "…FIG. 3 depicts a schematic block diagram of a workstation at which a user can review and update the digital image data and associated databases respectively, in accordance with the present invention; …")

15. With respect to Claim 7 and 15,

Davis and Gagne' discloses all of the above limitations, Davis further discloses,

- *the member is selected based on at least one of a skill set, experience with a similar task, response time, cost, security, and a preference of a producer, director, or client.* (see at least column 9, lines 15-19: "…The production scheduling capability of Animation Logistics System 23 includes all of the functions that interactively allow an administrator or supervisory person to establish or change the production priorities in the computer animation production system 2…"; Figures 4, 5, 8a, and 8b, column 12, lines 17-24: "…Referring to block 302 of FIG. 4, the routine WORK SELECTION (FIG. 5) (see Section IV(b)) is called to determine the production, sequence, and scene numbers (or identification) associated with a particular scene the user wishes to work on. During block 304, the ACCESS ARBITRATION routine (FIGS. 8a and 8b) (see Section IV(e)) is called to determine whether anyone else on the computer animation production system 2 currently has access to the requested scene…")

16. With respect to Claim 14,

Davis and Gagne' discloses all of the above limitations, Davis further discloses,

- *sending the digital content object to the computer;*(see at least Abstract: "…A computer animation production system (2) for processing digital image data is disclosed. The computer animation production system (2) contains at least one information processing device (44-76) for enabling at least one user to develop, utilize and enhance digital image data. …")
- *loading an animation project;* (see at least column 21, lines 50-54: "…FIG. 14 is a flow diagram of the DATA ENHANCEMENT routine referenced during the USER INTERACTION routine (FIG. 4) at block 312. At block 574 the digital image data to be enhanced is loaded into the image processor 76 (FIG. 3) of the workstation 44 (FIG. 3)…")
- *disassembling the animation project into at least one individual task to be performed on a digital content object;*

- *assigning the at least one individual task to an artist from the available artists at least partially as a function of a nationality or a georgraphic location associated with the artist and a national law or an international treaty, wherein the artist is associated with a computer;*

  (see at least column 10, lines 60-67: "…The worklist provides an organization for which the users are provided work assignments for particular scenes, etc. The database for a partial list of the information stored in the worklist includes: 1) production number, 2) sequence number, 3) scene number, 4) scene footage…")

- *receiving a modified digital content object from the second computer, wherein the modified digital context was formed by the at least one individual task* (see at least column 10, lines 3-15: "…Each entry on the Production Management Database corresponds to one or more scene databases which contains all of the information related to a scenes' organization and its informational content. Specifically, the scene database contains all the information required to access any of the files associated with a particular scene including exposure sheets, binding lists, scene composite databases and tests. Exposure sheets contain the bulk of information regarding a single scene: items such as fielding, timing, motion, special effects, cell order, etc. They are organized in the scene database reflecting the structure of the production, that is, they are retrieved by the production, sequence and scene numbers…")

17. With respect to Claim 19,

    Davis and Gagne disclose all of the above limitations, Gagne' further discloses,

    - *wherein the pool of reusable characteristics is developed at least in part by the artist*(see at least column 10, lines30-36: "…While groups in accordance with the present can be used to develop complex, interactive animation effects where objects automatically react to the state of another object, the object itself (i.e.--its own position scale, etc.) or other

condition, the present invention can also be employed by animators at a development stage to alert the animator to undesired states within the animation…")

18. Claims 11-13, and 24-26, are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Gagne' in further view of Gardner et al., US Patent Application Publication No US2004/0225608 A1.

19. With respect to Claim 11,

Davis and Gagne' disclose all of the above limitations. The combination of Davis and does not distinctly disclose the following limitations, but Gardner however as shown discloses,

- *the updated at least one character or feature is viewable by a customer.* (see at least Abstract: "…An electronic inserter, bill processing server and interactive bill presentation server are used to make the primary and secondary documents available for viewing by a user via the user's web browser…"; paragraph 26: "…This bill status update information typically includes the customer account number, the date the bill was run, whether the bill has been loaded, whether it has been accessed by the customer, whether it has been paid by the customer and the like. Some of this information as generated by the IBPS is received via communication path 48 from the customer at his or her computer via the associated browser software 54 that is run on the customer's computer 52…")

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the animation system of Gagne, with the digital document delivery system of Gardner because this would be an efficient means for notifying, updating and presenting documents to users for viewing.

20. With respect to Claim 12, and 25,

Davis, Gagne' and Gardner disclose all of the above limitations. Gardner further discloses,

- *the customer may post feedback* viewable *by at least one of the member and an administrator.*(see at least paragraph 5: "…Conflicts in the routing rules are resolved so that the message can be reformatted if needed, and feedback about the distribution can be provided to the sender so as to assist the sender in ascertaining the quality of service with respect to the delivery of the message to the recipient…")

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the animation system of Gagne, with the Animation Logistics System of Davis with the digital document delivery system of Gardner because this would be an effective means for customers to communicate with the digital document delivery system, obtain information therefrom, and perform tasks therewith.

21. With respect to Claim 13 and 26,

Davis, Gagne' and Gardner disclose all of the above limitations, Davis further discloses,

- *a messenger configured to notify at least one of the member and the administrator of the feedback.*(column 13, lines 57-65 thru column 14, lines 23-32: "…At block 340, the requestor's credentials are received by the Animation Logistics System 23. During block 342, the Animation Logistics System 23 determines whether the host and user's identification are valid. If, for example, the user is not an authorized user of the system, then processing continues at block 344, during which a "invalid" message is sent back to the workstation over the first global area network 4 (FIGS. 1 and 3). At block 350, the "invalid" message is received by the workstation 44-76.")

.

22. Claims 27-38 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gagne', US Patent No. US 6,353,437 B1 in view of Turner et al., US Patent No. 6,747,650 B2.

23. With respect to Claims 27 and 33,

Gagne' discloses the following,

- *searching for at least one first characteristic in a pool of reusable characteristics stored on computer readable media (*see at column 2, lines 33-36: "…The digital image data includes pixel characteristic information for image reproduction on the at least one information processing device…"; Figure 13, column 4 lines 16-21: "…FIG. 13 is a flow diagram which depicts the sequence of operations of the Animation Logistics System for searching each volume directory of a cluster in order to locate a requested digital image data file under control of the SEARCH EACH CLUSTER VOLUME DIRECTORY routine referenced in FIG. 12a…")

Gagne discloses all of the above limitations, Gagne does not disclose the following limitations, but Turner however discloses,

- *identifying at least one second characteristic wherein the at least one first characteristic has been determined to depend on the at least one second first characteristic;*
- *in response to a change in the at least one first characteristic during development of an animation object on a computer, sending notification to the computer indicating the dependence of the at least one first characteristic on at least one second characteristic;*

(see at column 1, lines 38-47: "... Still a further embodiment includes displaying a first object representing data corresponding to a first combination of variables and a second object representing data corresponding to a second combination of the variables with animation. The animation includes a first animation characteristic that is generally the same for both the first object and the second object to visually group both objects together, and a second animation characteristic that varies with the value of the one of the variables to visualize variation of the one of the objects between the first and second objects…")

- *locating digital content containing the at least one second characteristic; and providing the digital content to the computer.* (see at least column 2, lines 6-11: "…The objects of the visualization are each animated in accordance with the respective one of the object animation patterns with a first characteristic to indicate membership of the objects in a

group and a second characteristic to indicate variation of the one of the data dimensions among members of the group….")

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the animation system of Gagne with the animation techniques of Turner because this would be an efficient means for visualizing data with a computer system that represents the data relative to a number of variables and includes a number of data objects each representing a relationship to one of the variables.

24. With respect to Claims 28, and 34,

Gagne' and Turner disclose all of the above limitations, Gagne' further discloses,

- *wherein the pool of reusable characteristics is developed at least in part by an administrator*. (see at least column 5, lines 63-67: "…permitting an animator to define a dynamic group wherein the membership of objects in the group is determined according to a rule evaluated at appropriate intervals and each member of the group inherits the parameters, if any, defined for that group.

25. With respect to Claims 29, 30, 35 and 36,

Gagne' and Turner disclose all of the above limitations, Gagne' further discloses,

- *wherein the pool of reusable characteristics is developed at least in part by at least one member of the pool of available artists*. (see at least column 6, lines 1-6: "…Essentially, the animator defines a dynamic group by defining a membership rule for the group and can then, or subsequently, define one or more parameters to be applied to the group…")

26. With respect to Claim 31 and 37,

Gagne', and Turner disclose all of the above limitations. Turner further discloses,

- *identifying is based on at least one of a first identifier associated with the at least one first characteristic and a second identifier associated with the at least one second*

characteristic. (see at least Figure 3, column 5, lines 65-67, thru column 6, lines 1-9: "…Subroutine 220 starts in stage 222 with the selection of an animation pattern to represent a dependence of one or more visualization objects on a variable. A pattern can be selected from a predefined list or a custom pattern defined by an operator through appropriate interface logic executed by processor(s) 22. In one non limiting example, an operator defines the animation pattern by tracing a desired path of animated movement interactively…."; "…the selection of an animation pattern can include selecting an animation characteristic that is common to all visualization objects dependent on the variable to be represented by the animation pattern in stage 223…"))

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the animation system of Gagne with the animation techniques of Turner because this would be an efficient means for providing varying animation patterns, specifically animation characteristics which can be selected in addition to common animation characteristics that can visually vary to indicate differences in level, value, and/or degree of the variable common to the objects of the group.

27. With respect to Claims 32, and 38,

Gagne' and Turner disclose all of the above limitations, Gagne' further discloses,

- *the pool of reusable characteristics is configured to accept input to update the at least one reusable characteristic while the at least one reusable characteristic is in use*. (see at least column 6, lines 10-13: "…when an animator is interacting wit a scene, the membership rule can be evaluated after each user interface event so that the results of any changes made by the animator are shown to the animator as they are made…")

Response to Arguments

28. Applicant's arguments filed on February 11, 2010 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

Referring to independent claim 1, Applicant argued in general terms that "…the combinations of Davis, Gagne', and ordinary knowledge in the art fails to teach or suggest all the recitations of independent claim 1…" (Applicant's remarks/arguments, page 9, third paragraph). Examiner respectfully disagrees all of the allegations as argued. Examiner, in the previous office action, gave detail explanation of claimed limitation and pointed out exact locations in the cited prior art. Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification. See MPEP 2111 {R-1} Interpretation of Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation.

During patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.' Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the Examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969). In response, all of the limitations which Applicant disputes as missing in the applied references is fully discloses or obvious in view of the collective teachings of Davis, Gagne, Gardner, and Turner.

Davis is directed to a method for coordinating production of an animated feature using a logistics system. Davis also discloses a computer animation production system which communicates digital control information via at least one global area network for enabling at least one user to develop, utilize and enhance digital image data. (Abstract). Furthermore, applicant admits Davis generally describes a production system with which multiple users can collaborate to create an animation product. Gagne discloses an animation system and method for defining and using one or more groups of objects in an animation, and allows an animator to define at least one membership rule that determines membership of an object in a group. Gagne recites (column 6, lines 9-13), …when an animator is interacting with a scene, the membership rule can be evaluated after each user interface event so that the results of any changes made by the animator are shown to the animator as they are made. Any new parameters will be propagated to the members and any parameters which been

removed will be dropped by all members of the group. Moreover applicant admits Gagne discloses a certain type of kinematic relationship between elements of an animation character (e.g. joint node characteristics). Gardner provides an efficient means for notifying, updating and presenting documents to users for viewing. Turner provides an efficient means for providing varying animation patterns, specifically animation characteristics which can be selected in addition to common animation characteristics that can visually vary to indicate differences in level, value, and/or degree of the variable common to the objects of the group. Moreover, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method for coordinating production of an animated feature of Davis with the rules based animation system of Gagne' and the digital document delivery system of Gardner for customers to communicate and obtain information therefrom, and perform tasks with the animation techniques of Turner to include but not limited to varying animation patterns, and characteristics. Detailed explanations are given in the preceding sections of the present Office Action.

Conclusion

29. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37CFR 1.136(a).

30. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however,

will the statutory period fro reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

31. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to **Kimberly L. Evans** whose telephone number is **571.270.3929.** The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, **John Weiss** can be reached at **571.272.6812.**

32. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov >. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866.217.9197** (toll-free). Any response to this action should be mailed to: **Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 or faxed to **571-273-8300**. Hand delivered responses should be brought to the **United States Patent and Trademark Office Customer Service Window**: Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.

/KIMBERLY EVANS/

Examiner, Art Unit 3629

/Jamisue A. Plucinski/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3629